12/10/73

Dear Ed,

The two stories from The Village Voice of 11/29/73 with your 12/5 are interesting. I'd heard of the Vidal piece in NYReview and hope someone will come up with a copy. It is two weeks back. It seems like one of the necessary approaches and for it Vidal has the best qualifications as it relates to Hunt. (Which reminds me, did you not say you would be sending me the Penthouse article? If you did, that letter has not come.)

The Golz piece interests me for other reasons. I have just read Noyes' really terrible Legacy of Doubt. In it he credits Golz. This piece comes from that book, with inconsequential amplification, and it makes no mention of the book. Or possibly that is Golz' work and Nayes used it. I suggest no credit means bad blood. I think Golz was a Bud's nuttery. If he was, he avoided me. I met him in Dallas 12/71.

Your letter is absolutely correct with regard to this article and more to the book, where there was more space. Neither establishes anything. The arctile appears to be more credible than the book, which has none at all. I canot really tell you how awful it is.

The hint of Braden-Ruby and Braden-Ferrie links are in the book. They are also entirely without substance. More, they are not even reasonable probabilities the way Noyes handles them.

The Marcello-Ferrie tie is vastly overblown. I know of only rumor making any direct connection, of Ferrie as his pilot on return from Guatemala. His work as Marcello's investigator was for G. Wray Gill, the lawyer, not for Marcello directly. Ferrie was in such straits when he died it is hard to believe he was a Marcello man on that basis alone.

This link is alleged by Noyes because Braden used the address of a man whose office was on the 17th floor of the Pere Marquette Building in N.O. and that is where Gill's was. Why not then make the same "link" with, say, Shaw's lawyers? It is no connection at all.

The quote from Reid, also in Noyes, is specious. Nobody had to knock off JFK to get Bobby and there was bound to be the world's greatest manhunt when JFK was killed, if one went by what could be anticipated.

What need could there have been for a lookout man to report back or a bag-man at the scene of the crime. Does not common sense say that one would not pay off on the spot and no report other than the press was needed? Why run this rick. This is insanity, not reasoning.

And assuming the rest to be true, which I do not, what difference can it make?

When Golz doesn't know the number of Warren volumes and says Mark's book was the first and Garrison's effort the last, I am not inclined to accept what seems reasonable as fact, not on his representation.

There will probably never be any resolution of the multitudinous problems created by the many misuses of the tramp pictures. If there was a basis for belief they could provide any kind of lead, and my own investigations yield none and have the opposite thrust, this misuse has destroyed it. That the FBI seems to have found its own use in the Ray case leads me to believe that they believe there is no possibility. I can't imagine running this risk without the certainty those pictures represent nothing. They had to know it would be possible to trace that sketch and I have done it.

I have heard by phone since beginning that I am getting the Vidal piece. So if you see it, don't bother to copy, thanks.

Hope you are having a good holiday season.

Thanks and best,